

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks herewith. The present Amendment is being made to facilitate prosecution of the application.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS

Claims 1-7 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 4 and 7, which are independent, are hereby amended. Support for this amendment is provided throughout the specification as originally filed, specifically in at Figure 29.

No new matter has been introduced by this amendment. It is submitted that these claims, as originally presented, were in full compliance with the requirements 35 U.S.C. §112. Changes to claims are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103, or §112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicants are entitled.

II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-5 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,835,144 to Matsumura, et al. (hereinafter, merely "Matsumura") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,493,041 to Hanko, et al. (hereinafter, merely "Hanko") and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,719,620 to Machino et al. (hereinafter, merely "Machino") and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,034,733 to Balram, et al. (hereinafter, merely "Balram").

Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Matsumura in view of Hanko, Machino, Balram, and further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 3,971,888 to Ching, et al. (hereinafter, merely "Ching").

III. RESPONSE TO REJECTIONS

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

“...means for receiving a frame end signal that is synchronized with end of frame data and is indicative of the end of each of a number of frames;

...signal processing means for executing an action on the variable length code active at the start detected by said start detecting means, for making the action on the variable length code inactive at the end detected by said end detecting means, and for initializing the state of the action on the variable length code at the end detected by said end detecting means,

wherein the level of an enable signal is altered between a high level and a low level based on a frame end signal and a result of a detected start code,

wherein, when the start of a frame is not detected, the data received after the frame end signal of the previous frame and before the start of a next frame is not processed and is designated invalid allowing immediate processing of the next frame thereby eliminating invalid data and reducing further lost data.

First, the Office Action (see page 2) relies on column 10, lines 51-59 and column 8, lines 35-50 of Matsumura to reject means for receiving a frame end signal that is synchronized with end of frame data and is indicative of the end of each of a number of frames, as recited in claim 1 (emphasis added). The cited portion of Matsumura discloses an ending macroblock address and end-of-macroblock in direct contrast with Applicants' claimed a frame end signal.

Applicants respectfully submit that macroblock and frame are different matters. Therefore, Matsumura fails to teach or suggest the above-identified feature of claim 1.

1. Second, the Office Action (see page 3) relies on column 6, lines 55-65, column 9, lines 35-50, and column 10, lines 51-59 of Matsumura to reject signal processing means for executing an action on the variable length code active at the start detected by said start detecting means, for making the action on the variable length code inactive at the end detected by said end detecting means, and for initializing the state of the action on the variable length code at the end detected by said end detecting means, as recited in claim 1 (emphasis added). Applicants respectfully submit that nothing in Matsumura teaches or suggests signal processing means for making an action .. active.... for making the action...inactive.... and for initializing the state of the action..., as claimed by Applicants.

Furthermore, the Office Action (see page 3) concedes that Matsumura fails to teach or suggest wherein, when the start of a frame is not detected, the data received after the frame end signal of the previous frame and before the start of a next frame is not processed and is designated invalid allowing immediate processing of the next frame thereby eliminating invalid data and reducing further lost data, as recited in claim 1 (emphasis added). The Office Action further relies on column 8, lines 45-50 of Hanko and column 3, lines 43-50 of Machino to disclose the above-identified features of claim 1. The cited portion of Hanko discloses a processing of current frame received before the end of frame signal in direct contrast with Applicants' claimed data received after the frame end signal of the previous frame and before the start of a next frame. The cited portion of Machino discloses outputting the next frame immediately after the predetermined period (T_A) elapses if a terminal does not detect a frame - start signal in direct contrast with Applicants' claimed immediate processing of the next frame.

when the start of a frame is not detected. Applicants respectfully submit that Matsumura, Hanko, Machino, Balram, and Ching, taken either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the above-identified features of claim 1.

Finally, Applicants respectfully submit that Matsumura, Hanko, Machino, Balram, and Ching, taken either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest wherein the level of an enable signal is altered between a high level and a low level based on a frame end signal and a result of a detected start code, as recited in claim 1 (emphasis added).

Therefore, claim 1 is patentable.

For reason similar to those above, independent claims 4 and 7 are also patentable.

IV. DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In the event the Examiner disagrees with any of statements appearing above with respect to the disclosure in the cited references, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate the portion, or portions, of the reference, or references, providing the basis for a contrary view.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable and Applicants respectfully request early passage to issue of the present application.

Please charge any additional fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicants

By 
Thomas F. Presson
Reg. No. 41,442
(212) 588-0800